

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the Office Action, Applicant requests reconsideration for allowance of Claims 1 through 21 as presented herein. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 10, 12 through 18 and 20 through 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teaching of U.S. Patent 6,161,005 to Pinzon in view of U.S. Patent 6,380,842 to Mattes et al. The claims currently pending in this application include independent Claims 1 and 14. Claim 1 is directed to a barrier operator system which includes at least one remote controller including a speech activatable unit comprising a speech recognition module which is programmed to recognize one or more spoken gateway words and one or more spoken command words for effecting operation of a barrier to move between open and closed positions. Claims 2 through 13 refer back to and further restrict Claim 1.

Independent Claim 14 is directed to a door operator system which includes a wall mounted remote controller including a speech activatable unit comprising a speech recognition module which is programmed to recognize one or more spoken gateway words and one or more spoken command words for effecting operation of an upward acting door to move between open and closed positions. Claim 14 further requires a microcontroller operably connected to a radio frequency transmitter and to the speech recognition module for transmitting a signal to the radio frequency transmitter on receipt of a signal from the speech

recognition module. Claims 15 through 21 refer back to and further restrict independent Claim 14.

Reconsideration for allowance of independent Claims 1 and 14 and the claims dependent thereon, respectively, is requested for the following reasons. Both Claims 1 and 14 include the requirement of a speech recognition module which is programmed to recognize one or more spoken gateway words and one or more spoken command words for effecting operation of a barrier or door. The provision of a programmed speech recognition module which recognizes a gateway word and a command word is important in the operation of a barrier operator system having a remote controller including, for example, a wall mounted remote controller, as required by Claim 14.

Doors or barriers which are inadvertently operated can, of course, cause damage or injury. A remote controller adapted for signal transmitting communication to a barrier operator system based on spoken words for an activation signal should be protected against inadvertent actuation if, for example, the user has programmed the speech recognition module to recognize a common command word such as "open" or "close". Accordingly, the provision of a gateway word and a command word to effect operation of a barrier operator including, for example, a garage door operator, adds a measure of control to avoid inadvertent activation. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to recognize a barrier or door operator system having such features as required by Claims 1 and 14.

With regard to the teaching of the Pinzon reference, although this reference is directed to a control system for a remote door locking and unlocking system, which control system may include a telephone receiver/DTMF or speech decoder, Pinzon fails to disclose or suggest the provision of a speech recognition module programmed to recognize one or more spoken gateway words and one or more spoken command words. In this regard also, the Mattes et al. reference is lacking in disclosing or suggesting the provision of such a feature in a barrier operator system or a door operator system which includes a remote controller. Mattes et al. does disclose that the key or keyfob (2) may be modified to include a speech recognition circuit (42) and that such a circuit may be equipped for speaker dependent or speaker independent operation. However, Mattes et al. fails to disclose or suggest the requirement for gateway words and command words as required by Claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, neither Pinzon nor Mattes et al., when considered alone or one modified in view of the other, disclose or suggest the overall combination of features set forth in Claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, reconsideration for allowance of Claims 1 and 14 is respectfully solicited.

Reconsideration for allowance of Claims 2 through 13, dependent on Claim 1, is requested at least for the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of Claim 1.

Claims 15 through 21 refer back to and further restrict Claim 14 and reconsideration for allowance of Claims 15 through

Appl. Ser. No. 09/909,400
Amendment Dated August 31, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 31, 2005

21 is requested for the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of Claim 14.

Applicant has made a further diligent effort to advance the prosecution of this application by pointing out with particularity herein how the claims distinguish over the prior art. An early Notice of Allowance of Claims 1 through 21 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Aug. 31, 2005

Michael E. Martin
Michael E. Martin
Registration No. 24,821
Agent for Applicant

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP
1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761
Phone (214) 999-3000
Fax (214) 999-3623

DALLAS 1568716v1